



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,283	01/08/2001	Donald Moreaux	10002227-1	7009

7590 06/09/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

FOWLKES, ANDRE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/757,283

Applicant(s)

MOREAUX ET AL.

Examiner

Andre R. Fowlkes

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/12/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 4/12/04.
2. The objections to the drawings are withdrawn, in view of applicant's amendment.
3. The objections to the specification are withdrawn, in view of applicant's amendment.
4. The objection to claim 17 is withdrawn, in view of applicant's amendment
5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker et al. (Parker), U.S. Patent No. 5,781,720.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker et al. (Parker), U.S. Patent No. 5,781,720.

As per claim 1, Parker discloses:

- A method for automated testing of a graphical user interface (GUI) of a program, said method comprising: creating a test case file comprising a plurality of test steps in a text format (Abstract lines 1-3, "A method for automated testing of ...

computer application programs which use a Graphical User Interface", and figure 4, label 315 show the test case file (a plurality of test steps in a text format))

- **executing a test harness with said test case file as input to said test harness** (figure 4 labels 315, 317, 320, and 321)

- **said test harness configured to execute one of a plurality of automated tests in response to one of a plurality of test steps** (Abstract line 8, "(the invention provides a) test executive (test harness) which executes the test script")

- **each automated test configured to test a corresponding user interface element of said program through a GUI map** (Abstract lines 9-10, "The test script is directed towards operation on logical objects", and col. 17 lines 3-5, "Mapping between ... logical object names and actual runtime GUI object names is one of the ... tasks performed by the test tool")

- **said GUI map configured to define a logical name for each user interface element of said program** (col. 17 lines 3-5, "Mapping between ... logical object names and actual runtime GUI object names is one of the ... tasks performed by the test tool").

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Parker discloses that **each test step comprises an object, an action, and an identification reference** (col. 4 lines 21-26, "At the time of execution of the test script, the test executive and the test driver take the reference to the logical objects (identification reference) contained in the script and translate them into a form which allows the invention to identify, manipulate and query the actual objects under test in the specific GUI").

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Parker discloses that **each test step further comprises an optional field value** (col. 27 lines 45-48, "A test script ... can read this default value (optional field value) from the database").

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Parker discloses that **each test step further comprises an error recovery value** (col. 14 lines 35-40, "Upon receiving the error report, the test executive can invoke an exception handler. The exception handler may decide either to abort further processing of the script (one possible error recovery value), or it may decide to clean up after the error and continue processing, giving control to the next script command (another possible error recovery value)").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Parker discloses **generating said GUI map of said program by extracting a logical name, a physical name, an identification, and an ordinal value for each user interface element of said program** (col. 27 lines 12-16, "The functional specification repository (GUI map) is a database which contains information about the functional specifications of the application being tested. It includes detailed information about each window (user interface element) in the application", and col. 27 lines 28-31, "The information contained in functional specification repository may be extracted from a resource file, the application source code, and/or the applications executable source code", and figure 9 labels F, B, A, and D show the logical name, physical name, identification, and ordinal value, respectively).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Parker discloses **generating said GUI map of said program from one of a prototype of said program, a design document of said program and an earlier version of said program** (col. 27 lines 28-31, "The information contained in functional specification repository (GUI map) may be extracted from a resource file (prototype or design document), the (earlier version of the) application source code, and/or the applications executable source code").

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Parker discloses that **each automated test is further configured to retrieve and to execute at least one of a plurality of associated reusable functions in response to said one of said plurality of test steps** (col. 7 lines 29-42, "The basic features required in the test script and test executives are: ...built-in standard functions which allow access to User Interface Driver functionality; user-defined functions and procedures with parameter passing modes of in, out, and inout; and script modules for creating a reusable library of routines").

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Parker discloses **outputting results of the execution of said plurality of automated tests in response to said test file** (col. 30 lines 41-43, "When a script or group of scripts are executed, a single results file is created which stores all the information pertinent to the execution").

As per claim 9, Parker discloses **a system for automated testing of a graphical user interface (GUI) of an application, said system comprising: at least**

one processor (col. 33 lines 39-41, "(The) test driver ... and GUI ... both reside on a different processor"), **a memory coupled to said at least one processor, a test harness residing in said memory and executed by said at least one processor,** (col. 12 lines 54-55, "the test driver (harness) ... can ... examine these tables in memory"), **wherein said test harness is configured to execute one of a plurality of automated tests in response to one of a plurality of test steps of a text format test data file,** (Abstract line 8, "(the invention provides a) test executive (test harness) which executes the test script (i.e. text format test data file)"), **each automated test configured to test a corresponding user interface element of said program through a GUI map** (Abstract lines 9-10, "The test script is directed towards operation on logical objects", and col. 17 lines 3-5, "Mapping between ... logical object names and actual runtime GUI object names is one of the ... tasks performed by the test tool"), and **said GUI map configured to define a logical name for each user interface element of said program** (col. 17 lines 3-5, "Mapping between ... logical object names and actual runtime GUI object names is one of the ... tasks performed by the test tool").

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 10 is a system claim corresponding to claim 2 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further claim 11 is a system claim corresponding to claim 3 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further claim 12 is a system claim corresponding to claim 4 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 13 is a system claim corresponding to claim 5 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 14 is a system claim corresponding to claim 6 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 15 is a system claim corresponding to claim 7 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 16 is a system claim corresponding to claim 8 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Claim 17 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 1 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and further claim 18 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 5 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and further claim 19 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 8 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and further claim 20 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 7 and is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 4/12/04, with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

1) Using a "test case file" comprising "a plurality of test steps in a text format" containing "English-like" description steps of each testing scenario, as disclosed in the applicants specification, is different from using a script file created with a full featured programming language, as disclosed in the Parker patent.

Examiner's response:

1) It should be noted that such language "in a text format" are not recited in claims 1 and 17. Thus, the arguments are moot. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., English-like description steps) are not recited

Art Unit: 2122

in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

2) Using a test script that contains the user events to be simulated, control and data structures and application programs responses, is different from using a test case file comprising a plurality of test steps in a text format.

Examiner's response:

2) Parker discloses that "a test tool typically uses scripts", (Parker, Col. 2 line 14) in the background section, prior to describing the specific script used in the patent. A script is a computer program that is written in an interpreted programming language, and therefore stays in a human-readable text format. Additionally, Parker discloses that the test script contains user events (i.e. test steps).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre R. Fowlkes whose telephone number is (703)305-8889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703)305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ARF


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER